34

A GLOBAL AGENDA FOR ETHICAL LANGUAGE AND INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

Malcolm N. MacDonald

1. INTRODUCTION

During the eight years since the first edition of this handbook (Jackson 2012), the field of intercultural communication has at once both expanded and become more crowded. Recently, two handbooks have been added to the Routledge series: one bringing together topics relating to language and 'superdiversity' (Creese and Blackledge 2017); and one bringing together topics relating to language and migration (Canagarajah 2017). Both these areas overlap with and impact upon the field of intercultural communication, and arguably, are epistemological spaces from which much of the most dynamic recent thinking in applied linguistics and communication studies has emerged. Two new journals have also been launched: one occupying the 'centre ground' of intercultural communication, publishing papers related to intercultural communication and education (McConachy 2018 to present); and one extending the ethical parameters of 'interculturality' by creating a forum for research relating to 'bias, identity and diversities in education' (Dervin, Layne and Simpson 2016 to present). However, as is reflected by the range of chapters in this collection, the agenda for intercultural communication research is perhaps more wide-ranging than any single one of these newcomers to the field. If the idea of superdiversity suggests extreme variation within a particular politically and geographically bounded space, and migration suggests the ways in which languages travel with their speakers from one location to another,

intercultural communication engages with the use of language both within and across social and geographic space. Intercultural communication also conventionally includes a concern with the cognitive as well as the social aspects of language and of communication, although the relationship between these two foci remains one of the areas most ripe for contestation.

This chapter first sets out the historical and material context of globalisation and transnational mobility. It then outlines contributions made in recent intercultural communication research, particularly those relating to multiculturalism and identity, and the internationalisation of universities. The following section sets out three contemporary areas of intercultural research: transnational mobility; pedagogy and intercultural training; and aesthetic and creative approaches to ethical intercultural communication. Recommendations are then made for the pursuit of intersubjectivity and social activism in intercultural communication research and practice. The chapter concludes by imagining the possibilities for a truly 'global' agenda for ethical language and intercultural communication research and practice, by advocating a more diverse and dialogic epistemology within the field.

2. HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

Contemporary communication within and between 'cultures' is embedded in the social and material conditions of late modernity. In this, intercultural communication is often associated with the phenomenon of globalisation. For Bryan Turner, globalisation 'involves the compression of time and space, the increased interconnectivity of human groups, the increased values of the exchange of commodities, people and ideas, and finally the emergence of various forms of global consciousness which ... we may call

cosmopolitanism' (Turner and Holton 2016: 5). However, it is not inevitable that globalisation operates for the betterment of everybody's life (Bauman 1998), nor is it necessarily a recent phenomenon (Hirst, Thompson and Bromley 2009; Hoerder, 2002). Global flows of trade and travel between different territories – along with the associated intermingling of languages and cultures - can be traced back over two thousand years, as far back as the imperial powers of Greece and Rome, the great trading nations of the Levant, and the mighty Silk Road which stretched from Merv to ancient Chang'an.

However, as we approach the third decade of the millennium, globalisation and its concomitant 'global communication' exhibit all the affordances provided by the contemporary technologies of work and leisure, travel and education which have informed Chapters 26-35 of this volume. One material aspect of this contemporary phase of globalisation that is powerfully related to communication between cultures is 'transnational mobility', or the movement of populations between nation states (Faist 2000, 2016; Faist, Fauser and Reisenauer 2013). These mobile populations are referred to by the International Organization for Migration as 'transnational communities' (IOM 2018). For Faist, transnational mobility exhibits three features: the numbers of people migrating and the directions in which they move during a particular historical period; the social conditions under which migrants reside within the modern nation state; and the socio-psychological relationship of migrants to their home country and their country of destination. These conditions impact upon the communication which takes place between individual migrants and between groups of migrants and indigenous populations, while simultaneously being constituted by it.

According to the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA), the number of people migrating across national borders continues to rise rapidly. The total number of migrants in 2017 amounted to 258 million people, representing 3.4 per cent of the world population (UN DESA 2017: 4-5). Of these, the numbers forcibly displaced across international borders has also continued to increase. By the end of 2016, the total number of refugees and asylum seekers worldwide was estimated at 25.9 million, amounting to slightly over 10 per cent of all international migrants (UN DESA 2017: 7). Although the USA was the principal destination country for international migrants for at least fifty years, most international migrants now travel towards Asia and Europe, with North America now being the third most popular destination. This direction of travel is often driven by the desire to gain more lucrative work, or to undertake lengthy periods of education. However, the last decade has also witnessed the largest forced displacement of people since the Second World War. For example, from 2015 to 2016 the civil war in Syria resulted in the displacement of 5.5 million people. Most of these sought refuge across the border in Turkey, while many others resettled in countries including Germany, Sweden, the USA, Canada and the UK. Continuing instability and violence also led to 2.5 million refugees leaving Afghanistan in 2016, while the widespread violence that flared up in South Sudan led to the displacement of 1.4 million refugees by the end of the same year (IOM 2018: 33).

Despite these trends, migration across international borders is nowhere near as great as displacement and relocation within national borders. The International Migration Organisation firmly states that 'remaining within one's country of birth

overwhelmingly remains the norm. The great majority of people in the world do not migrate across borders; much larger numbers migrate within countries' (IOM 2018: 2). The most recent estimate taken ten years ago, indicated that 'more than 740 million people had migrated within their own country of birth' (UNDP 2009: 13). These large movements of internal migration take place within the nation state, traversing regional boundaries often in search of more lucrative work, for example in the case of the recent movement of labour from rural to urban areas of China.

Yet the second decade of the twenty-first century also saw the flipside of the increase in international migration. Since the first edition of this handbook, we have witnessed an intensification of attempts to regulate and inhibit the flow of populations. Although the numbers of people involved in South-South migration are greater (Faist et al. 2016: 5-6), barriers are most evident in migration from the global South to the global North. This has been exemplified over the past decade by: the maintenance of the Mediterranean Sea as a physical barrier to migrants seeking to access Europe from the coast of North Africa; the policing of the coastline of North Africa to restrict the availability of transportation; the erection of physical barriers by security forces on the Hungarian border to block refugees seeking to access Europe; the politicisation of the Mexico-US border during the 2016 US election campaign and the ensuing US presidency. The changes in the dynamic of transnational migration that have taken place since 2012 have inevitably impacted upon the patterns and 'ethos' of intercultural communication that takes place both 'within borders' - between members of migrant and majority groups within destination countries; and 'across borders' - between migrant groups, their families and other social networks which they wish to maintain

with their countries of origin. These changes also raise concerns as to the ethical basis of the economic, legal and physical and inhibitions faced by members of transnational communities, the language and discourse whereby they are constituted, and the research which is carried out into these phenomena.

Within borders, communication between minority and majority ethnic groups is inextricably linked to the accessibility of citizens and non-citizens to equal rights under law, and the positioning of members of minority ethnic groups within the nation states in which they find themselves. The relationship between migration and the granting of citizenship to long term migrant workers is complex and varies from country to country and region to region. For example, Australia and Canada pursue a policy of selective immigration through which it is possible for migrants in favourable circumstances to obtain citizenship after a prolonged period of residence. However, for guest workers coming from outside the EU to those European countries which pursue more open immigration policies, citizenship is less readily available; and in many cases, such as for those seeking temporary work in the Gulf States, it is simply unachievable (Hoerder 2002: 575-6). Recently, however, there has been an intensification of the barriers to be surmounted by migrant workers seeking citizenship. While levels of language proficiency diverge across the 38 countries monitored by the most recent *Migrant Integration Policy Index* (2015), few provide enough language courses for applicants to succeed. There are even fewer courses for applicants to succeed in the citizenship tests, which are required in around half the countries monitored.

For immigrants who do achieve citizenship within a destination country, relations between majority and minority groups, as well as between different minority groups,

remain problematic (Modood 2007). For some time, multiculturalism has been the policy of choice not only for states which from their inception have incorporated diverse ethnic, religious and linguistic groups (e.g. India, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Singapore) but also for those which are prepared to grant citizenship to new arrivals (e.g. Australia, Canada, France, New Zealand and the UK). However, the realisation of the policy of multiculturalism in different countries varies, and different forms have been contested over the years (Kivisto 2002). Ideally, multiculturalism recognizes diversity between different groups within a society or nation state, and upholds the rights of members of different ethnic groups to practise distinctive cultural practices such as religion, language, dress, music and cuisine. However, given asymmetries of power between majority and minority ethnic groups, the complex differentiation of cultural practices between minority groups, and the challenges of incorporating an array of languages and religions, festivals and public holidays into any national public life, it is virtually impossible to recognize the cultural practices of different groups equally. Somewhere, certain groups are going to lose out – and this is unlikely to be the most dominant one. Thus critics argue that multiculturalism still leans overmuch towards the assimilation of minorities towards one dominant set of cultural practices, rather than a process of multilateral integration where the cultural practices of every ethnic group are accorded equal place (Modood 2007).

The outcome of increasing doubts about multiculturalism from both functional and ethical viewpoints has led to a radical shift in policy within the European Union. Now it is intercultural communication that is placed at the heart of the social cohesion of multi-ethnic European states. The Council of Europe's (2008) *White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue* asserts that '... old approaches to the management of cultural diversity were

no longer adequate to societies in which the degree of that diversity ... was unprecedented and ever-growing' (9). Instead, the paper proposes that the pursuit of 'intercultural dialogue' both as policy and social practice would uphold the values of diversity, human rights, freedom of expression and equality of opportunity more successfully than multiculturalism (ibid: 25-7). For the Council of Europe, intercultural dialogue is understood as: '...an open and respectful exchange of views between individuals, groups with different ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic backgrounds and heritage on the basis of mutual understanding and respect' (ibid: 10). Arguably, this dialogue requires three areas of 'competence': participation in democratic citizenship; learning languages – particularly those which predominate in the state; and knowledge of the history of different ethnic groups. Yet as Byram and Golubeva emphasize (Chapter 4), intercultural citizenship is not just limited to mediation within the single nation state. It '...goes beyond this, involving both activity with other people in the world, and the competences required for dialogue with people of other languacultures'(14). However, since the last edition of this handbook, the critique has been made that this version of citizenship is itself a cultural construct; and that the version of intercultural communication enshrined in the EU policy documents very much reflects an extension of the Enlightenment project, which is not necessarily commensurate with the ethical and political praxis of everyone around the world (Simpson & Dervin, 2019a).

So far, mobility has been described as if migrants are decanted from one 'container' to another; on this model, the nation state is conceived of as a geographically, politically and socially bounded space. Early conceptualisations of intercultural communication,

too, conceived of culture as being both homologous with the nation state and unamenable to interpenetration or synthesis (see Chapter 1). However, a considerable body of empirical research into the social and economic conditions of mobility has now consolidated the view that the migrant experience is no longer subject to crude binaries of regional or national affiliation, and it has been re-described in ways which embrace the economic, social and communication conditions of late modernity (Faist 2000). Not least, this research has revealed the contemporary material conditions which now dissolve the apparent solidity of national boundaries, such as: cross-border banking and technologies of international currency transfers; the global dispersion of international recruitment agencies; affordability and accessibility of international air travel; and ease of access to modes of telecommunication and ICT (after Faist, Fauser and Reisenauer 2013).

It is therefore possible to reconceptualise the idea of space, both analytically and phenomenologically, as the experience of individual social actors. On this argument, rather than spaces being viewed as either co-identical with state territories or with bounded physical or geographical locations, spaces can be conceived of as being constituted by the 'cultural, economic and political practices' of territorially located actors, which in turn create the 'links' between different places (Faist 2016). These practices, which more often than not entail some form of communication, therefore represent an expansion of social space across territorial boundaries which has led to 'a transformation in the spatial organisation of social and symbolic relations' (ibid: 4). Where these practices are interactions which are carried out with some degree of regularity between individual actors who have bonds to two or more nation-states, they

can be dubbed ‘transnational social spaces’. Transnational social spaces are constituted by a myriad of ‘ties’, which can be either social or symbolic. Social ties are ongoing transactions between three or more people, which entail ‘common interests, obligations, expectations and norms’. Symbolic ties are transactions in which social actors bring together ‘meanings, memories, expectations for the future and collective representations’ (ibid: 3-4). Faist’s conceptualisation of transnational space offers a framework which can help us understand the overarching historical, social and material conditions which underly basis for the range of topics that have been set out in this volume. Correspondingly, the insights afforded in previous chapters contribute to an understanding of the communicative mechanisms and processes of both the symbolic and transactional dimensions of transnational social spaces.

Since the last version of this chapter (MacDonald and O’Regan 2012), Faist *et al.* have now proposed three types of transnational space (2013: 56). Of these, ‘transnational circuits’ entail the diffusion of transactional and symbolic relations between actors in which information, goods, services and capital are exchanged in contexts which supersede the boundaries of the nation state. In this way, transnational circuits conveniently describe many of the social contexts for intercultural communication set out in Section IV of this volume: different types of pedagogic activity and educational exchange, both formal and informal (Chapters 26, 27, 28, 29); intercultural business education (Chapter 30); professional and workplace settings and partnerships (Chapter 31, 32); health care settings (Chapter 33); legal contexts (Chapter 34); tourist excursions (Chapter 35) and mediation across languages such as translation and interpreting (Chapter 11). However, transnational circuits also include other less

formalized contexts, which have been explored elsewhere, for example transnational advocacy networks and NGOs (e.g. Foottit, 2017, Witteborn 2010), as well as transnational creative activities such as drama (e.g. Frimberger 2016a, Harvey, McCormick and Vanden 2019) and music (e.g. Côrte-Real, Moreira and Lesenciuc 2016).

Two other types of transnational space also entail social and symbolic ties: transnational communities and transnational kinship groups (Faist *et al.* 2013). Transnational communities typically comprise religions and religious movements, such as the most populous world-wide religions; as well as religious diasporas. These religious collectivities are distinguished by the 'closeness' of their symbolic ties (Faist 2016: 9), in as much as these transnational communities achieve high degrees of emotional intensity and semiotic power from the symbolic content of their ceremonies, texts and rituals. Communication within religious communities has tended to be under-researched within our field, and where it has been, research has often engaged with some form of 'crossing' (after Rampton, 2005), e.g.: multicultural engagement with a single religious community in an informal setting (Kung 2015); or 'conversion' from one religious community to another (e.g. Islam, in Soutar 2010). However, with the increased emphasis on ecumenism and inter-faith dialogue which emerged towards the end of the twentieth century, a few forays into intercultural communication across religious communities have also been carried out (e.g. Lando, Muthuri and Odir 2015; Riitaoja and Dervin 2014; Wolf 2012).

From a sociological perspective, the family is the other social group which becomes of interest when it becomes scattered across transnational space. Household or family members can become dispersed abroad to work within a multinational company, or travel to another country or region to seek employment as contract workers, or in the most radical circumstances migrate permanently for reasons of remuneration or refuge. From a transnational perspective, the key to the communication between these networks is the remittance of income back to family members in their countries of origin. However the intercultural perspective has, perhaps rather singularly, been on the degree of 'acculturation' to which or migrants or expatriate workers undergo in relation to their host country. Intercultural research into families has also been carried out into the communication that takes place between 'intercultural couples': familial relationships where one partner who is a citizen of one country co-habits with a citizen of another country, who speaks a different first language (e.g. Cools, 2006).

3. CRITICAL ISSUES and TOPICS

The concept of transnationalism has challenged both assimilationist and pluralist theories of migrant integration. Assimilationist theories, which first developed in the US in the post-war period, posited that migrants would arrive in the destination country and gradually adapt to its language, culture and civic values. Eventually manifestations of cultural and ethnic differences between themselves and mainstream society would become minimised, if not within one generation, then within subsequent ones (Faist *et al.* 2013: 92-93). Arguably, many of the psychological theories of 'acculturation' which have subsequently underwritten models of intercultural competence derive from this modernist post-war ideology of migrant integration. Challenging linear models of

migrant assimilation, theories of ethnic pluralism subsequently developed on the basis of empirical evidence that many groups of migrants did not follow a linear path towards integration. Rather, they identified strongly with the practices, beliefs and values of other migrants who had arrived from the same country and national culture. Thus, advocates of multiculturalism emerged to champion the rights of citizens from different national cultures to simultaneously maintain the practices, beliefs and values of their home culture, while being granted full rights within the destination state (Faist et al. 2013: 93-94). These notions of the multiplicity of cultural practices, beliefs and values within one territorial space then became coterminous with the adoption of postmodern conceptualisations of the fluidity and indeterminateness of identity within intercultural studies.

The cultural identities of the inhabitants of different nation states, and the distribution of resources between different social groups and group fractions within multicultural societies, therefore, remains a fruitful area for research (see also Chapters 1,3, 7, 13). Two potentially productive theorisations of these relations which have recently emerged are those of *banal nationalism* and *intersectionality*. Also, one of the grounds where the nature of cultural identification is currently being contested is within global *university internationalisation* where, arguably, in many countries assimilationist policies are impacting upon one of the more transient transnational populations, and the one closest to many of our day-to-day pursuits: students undertaking university programmes.

Multiculturalism and identity

It is some time now since Holliday proposed that nationality be reinstated as a dimension of cultural identity, although in a manner markedly different from earlier,

more essentialist considerations (2010). While this research trajectory is most typically carried out to investigate the relations between either the minority ethnic group and the majority - or between the majority and the minority, Patiño-Santos and Márquez Reiter (2018) have investigated the ways in which the resources of language and discourse are used to constitute the identities of members of the Latin American community in London. Here, the authors investigate the ways in which nationals from different Latin American countries who have emigrated to the UK constitute their identities in relation to each other, while working in shops in a particular area of London. Unexpectedly, subjects from an immigrant group which is often regarded as homogeneous, discursively position each other with reference to – often disparaging – comments about migrants from other Spanish-speaking Latin American countries. The authors go on to posit the potentially productive construct of *banal interculturalism* (after Billig 1995), as 'a form of knowledge that emerges in the discourses that circulate among … migrants about other … migrants' (2018: 238). This framework has the potential to fine-tune our insights into understanding the nature of the relationships which are discursively constructed between different social groups and group fractions within particular migrant populations.

One of the issues which confronts migrants is their lack of power when negotiating access to resources in their destination country. This is particularly true regarding their access to health care, where aspects of diagnosis and treatment are often negotiated in a foreign language. This can requires mediation on the part of interpreters. Piacentini, O'Donnell, Phipps, Jackson & Stack (2018) investigate ways in which interpreters in health clinics in Glasgow go beyond the straightforward recoding of interactions in a

health care setting to also engaging with aspects of their patients' precarious immigration status. While Piacentini *et al*. do not completely discount the importance of language in health communication, they apply the wider-angle lens of *intersectionality* to the under-researched medical context of the 'home' and 'community', in order to consider how aspects of culture, ethnicity and migrant status can coalesce to create potential barriers to fruitful health communication. Here, interpreters find that in addition to the conventional challenges of mediating through different languages, they are also called upon to provide basic information about the health care system, and engage with wider issues of power and inequality arising the patients' migrant status.

Internationalisation of universities

Not least due to the fact that that many intercultural researchers also teach within the university sector, one of the foundational stamping grounds for research into intercultural communication has been engagement with the experience of students living and studying in different countries. This originated with the experience of 'modern and foreign language' students spending a year abroad in European countries (Byram 1997); and later for Jackson, Hong Kong students experiencing short sojourns in Europe and America (2008, 2010; see also Chapter 29). Most recently, with the rapid expansion and dispersion of populations of students who migrate to other countries to undertake entire degree programmes, this has led to a raft of research being carried out into the intercultural experience of international students who spend a greater length of time studying in another country, and in particular into how communication takes place between multicultural groups of students within the 'internationalised university'.

Much of the research into HE internationalisation has adopted a broadly normative approach – taking the project of university internationalisation at face value, and viewing this as a 'problem' to be solved in keeping with the modernist aim of mainstream applied linguistics (Brumfit 1995: 27). In this, much normative intercultural research has also tended to take the policy of 'integration' as the ideal social model to be achieved by campuses. Here, the university campus is constructed discursively as a microcosm of the nation state, and researchers can adopt a rather 'assimilationist' perspective, in some cases actually to measure the extent to which international students conform to hypostatised ideals of intercultural competence and awareness. However, the adoption of an *a priori* theoretical framework by internationalisation research possibly fails to acknowledge the extent to which both the 'home' and 'international' student experience may also be *transnational*, more in keeping with the framework outlined earlier. For the capacity of 'foreign' students to maintain links and ties with their home networks and communities may be quite as and vibrant and valuable as their capacity to become 'interculturally competent' in terms of their melding into the 'small cultures' of the physically located campuses where they live, work and play. And it is surely the very 'transnationalism' which international students bring to university campuses which enhances the experience of their indigenous colleagues.

However, critical voices have also emerged from our field in relation to the internationalisation of higher education, giving rise to a strand of research which mostly addresses internationalisation from the standpoint of policy critique. This has more often than not gone hand in hand with the increased marketisation of courses, which

reflects the commodification of education within the ethos of our current neoliberal phase of capitalism. For example Castro, Woodin, Lundgren and Byram (2016) have reported on ways in which student mobility is constituted within the discourses of internationalisation; and Collins (2018) has criticised the appropriation of the term 'intercultural' by the dominant discourses of the neoliberal university system. Various manifestations of 'education and the discourse of global neoliberalism' from around the world have been presented in Gray, O'Regan and Wallace's eponymous special issue of *Language and Intercultural Communication* (2018). The actual intercultural experience of those at the sharp end of internationalisation – staff and students - has also received attention in relation to the policy documents which set out what universities purport to achieve through their internationalisation strategies (Dippold, Bridges, Eccles and Mullen 2019). Here, the authors explore the extent to which the aspirations of university mission statements are actually reflected in students' lived experience in the seminar and lecture hall. However, despite the plethora of research already carried out into intercultural communication on campus, there still remains a need to gather grounded evidence based on students' actual experience of living and working interculturally in order to cast a critical lens upon some of more ideologically-driven university policies worldwide.

4. CURRENT CONTRIBUTIONS and RESEARCH

In the previous edition of this chapter, I wrote with O'Regan, 'there is scope for intercultural communication researchers to engage with the experiences of less privileged groups of sojourners such as migrant workers and those seeking asylum and refuge' (2012: 559-60). While we cannot claim that over the intervening years intercultural researchers have responded to this call, it is fair to say that some have

engaged synchronistically with the urgency of the current times. For, as we have seen, the economic and political events of the past decade have done nothing to ameliorate the material conditions of vast swathes of populations to whom the maunderings of the academy would seem at best remote, and at worst self-indulgent. In fact, some critical voices in our field are now expressing increasing impatience with what can be seen as the intractable introspection and self-preoccupation of the academy. This section will set out three areas in which initiatives have recently been carried out in relation to ethically informed research and practice in language and intercultural communication: transnational mobility; pedagogy and intercultural training; and aesthetic and creative approaches to intercultural communication, which also involve the body and the 'new materiality'.

Vulnerable transnational groups principally include refugees and asylum seekers, who are by their very nature exposed, deracinated both physically and in terms of their capacity for effective languaging in the countries through which they travel and in which they eventually settle, and in certain cases subjected to forms of abuse, and even torture. A number of initiatives, which have been carried out by interculturalists to intervene in these *transnationally mobile* groups, are suggestive of tactics and strategies which readers can adopt in order to inform their ethically-driven intercultural practice. A notable attempt to supersede the sometimes circular debates of the academy is presented in a special issue of *Language & Intercultural Communication*, entitled 'Translational Research: Language, Intercultural Communication and Social Action' (Ladegaard and Phipps 2020). The contributors to this collection describe a range of ethically informed intercultural initiatives that can be carried out for refugees and

migrants in their destination countries. For example, Burford-Rice, Augoustinos and Due (2020) explore the impact of negative media and political depictions of the South Sudanese community on their psychological health and well-being. In so doing, they discuss how their findings can be informed by participatory research methods. Schluter (2020) investigates the effectiveness of local initiatives to stimulate social justice for the Kurds living in Kawaguchi, Japan. The study concludes that the emergent opportunities that favour the documented, and the continuing risks that militate against the undocumented, suggest an unequal distribution of social justice for this migrant community. Greenbank and Marra (2020) explore a critical area of refugee resettlement, that of securing stable, desirable employment in host nations. They suggest new ways of supporting former refugees to find appropriate employment 'in a context in which their agency may be constrained and their strengths overlooked'. With respect to language learning, Hirsu (2020) examines aspects of a programme which builds robust language encounters between refugees and host communities. She concludes by proposing action-oriented principles to inform future language programmes, in order to support new ways of promoting social and linguistic integration through intercultural encounters. And finally, Scarabicchi (2020) explores a corpus of 'migrant manifestos', drafted as forms of resistance and challenge to the restrictions imposed on human movement across borders, as advocacy for people on the move. She examines their implications for the debate on agency, cosmopolitanism and advocacy within the current phase of globalisation.

Ethically informed praxis in *intercultural pedagogy and training* is also epitomised in Tange's (2016a, 2016b) accounts of her own personal transformation and its realisation

through her work with the scouting movement. Her own views on critical intercultural communication, global citizenship and cosmopolitanism changed dramatically during a trip from Aalborg to Paris in 2015 for a seminar on the global citizenship education programme of the World Organisation for Scout Movements. When Tange gathered together with her groups of scouts from different countries for their seminar on November 14th, they were confronted with the news that over 100 young people had been murdered the previous night in the terrorist attacks on the Bataclan theatre and the Stade de France. This led to her abandoning a more critical paper she had been planning on the construction of national stereotypes at the World Scout Jamboree, in order to focus more proactively on what she calls 'interconnectivity' (2016a). Over time, this has led Tange, working alongside other scout leaders, to develop an applied approach towards intercultural education with Danish scout groups which focuses on 'Learning by Doing' (after Kolb, 1984). This involves a reflection on the nature of multiculturalism, an intercultural encounter which might involve an act of hospitality with strangers, or a visit to an unfamiliar location. The programme concludes with a moment of communication and reflection, where groups of scouts can 'present their experiences in the form of a poster, a song or a theatre performance, thus sharing and discussing their experiences with "Culture"' (Tange 2018: 10).

Aesthetic and artistic interventions in intercultural communication, such as drama workshops, have also been initiated by a range of projects designed to promote and celebrate intercultural communication between participants. Examples of these have emerged over the past decade under the conditions of transnationalisation and displacement of populations outlined earlier. Scotland has emerged as one of the

European countries most willing to respond to the challenges of displaced populations over the past decade. Here, Glasgow has particularly welcomed many displaced by conflicts in the Middle East (Kay and Morrison, 2012). The Glasgow Refugee Asylum and Migration Network (GRAMNet) 'aims to bring together researchers and practitioners, NGOs and policy makers working with migrants, refugees and asylum seekers in Scotland' (https://gramnet. wordpress. com/about/). Through participating in a regular series of programmes, festivals and workshops, contributors to GRAMNet utilize a range of creative genres – including theatre, story-telling, film-making and music - in order to explore their experiences of diaspora, languaging and integration. Drama has also recently been used within the context of university internationalisation. For example, 'Dramatic Enquiry' is an initiative which has recently been developed and pioneered by Harvey, McCormick and Vanden (2019) working together respectively as an intercultural researcher, artistic director and producer of a small theatre company in the North of England. This 'participatory, reflective approach to education' aims not only to investigate 'students' perceptions and experiences of internationalisation and intercultural communication'; but also to enhance their intercultural learning and development (ibid: 4).

Intercultural research has also not only recorded and interpreted the ways in which *bodily and material symbol systems* are used to communicate across different cultures, but has also engaged participants in actively engaging with non-linguistic systems of representation and self-actualisation to create potentially transformative meanings. This involved researchers in one of the *Researching Multilingually at the Borders* case studies having to make ethically and aesthetically informed choices about how to

record and edit a short film which focused on multilingual participants (see also Chapter 6). For Frimberger (2016b), the decision was made to place not only her participants' songs in Maori and Gaelic in prominent positions within the film (115), but also to position the participants' multilingual responses to her interview questions before their English versions.

> Here, people's vernaculars were equally imbued with the embodied power to carry communication (and ultimately human connection) beyond the realms of speech. Thus, the final edit of the film artistically expresses our decision to acknowledge the embodied power of people's spoken languages in the face of our linguistic incompetence (ibid: 117).

This case study also focused on 'what happens when emotional distress crosses borders of geography, language, beliefs and practices'; here, 'different forms of expression beyond direct narration' were used as both 'restorative research methods and trauma-informed educational tools' in order to mediate and support migrant unaccompanied minors settled in Glasgow. In one workshop, the facilitator and the children exchanged simple songs in different languages in a process dubbed 'shared singing' (Frimberger 2016c). This process became simultaneously emblematic and constitutive of the 'common humanity' which emerged between the multilingual participants both because of and despite their 'linguistic incompetence'; and flying in the face of normative models of linguistic competence. On another occasion, the children's teacher engaged them in the crafting of 'identity boxes'. These were shoe boxes within which, and upon which, they could inscribe images, poems and artefacts in order to 'create' their sense of themselves in ways which transcended the linear trajectory of narratives constructed in any one language (Frimberger, White and Ma 2018).

5. RECOMMENDATIONS for PRACTICE

The endeavours described in the last two sections may be indicative of an increasing radicalisation, which is bringing certain trajectories of intercultural research together with an ethically-driven social practice. Ethnographic and qualitative approaches to intercultural research have been with us for some considerable time. And some research reported in the previous section has also drawn on the principles of critical pedagogy or transformative action research. Here the researcher does not just study the world in order to understand it, but rather engages with the world in order to change it. However, as a response to the increasing urgency of the material conditions set out at the beginning of this chapter, much of the intercultural research reported in the previous section goes further rather than this. First of all, both the ethical commitment of researchers and their modes of engagement have been driven by a combination of the principles of cosmopolitanism and the praxis of dialogical exchange, which Holliday and MacDonald (2019) have dubbed 'intercultural intersubjectivity'. And secondly, the terrain on which these principles are realised has also involved a particular intensity of personal commitment, not least those realised through creative and aesthetic initiatives.

From the perspective of a 'postmodern approach' (Holliday and MacDonald 2019), intersubjectivity is achieved in intercultural research by engaging dialogically with participants in the research process. Much intercultural research is still carried out through participant interviews, often accompanied by contextual observation. However, the research interview should not just be deployed as a pellucid lens through which self-

evident truths are offered up by research participants in what Dervin (2011) calls a 'solid approach to intercultural discourses'. In these cases,

> .. analysis is often based on a simple review of what research participants say during data collection…. This means that their discourse is taken at face value and serves the purpose of providing evidence and/or 'truth' … researchers rarely implicate themselves in the analysing section of their research (39).

Rather, the research interview should be regarded as a dialogic process, a 'two-way street', in which the researcher is rendered as transparently as the researched. Thus, a consideration of the positioning which is co-constructed between both the researcher and the researched is as important as a consideration of the research participant. In interpretive research, this might necessitate the 'bracketing' of the assumptions which researchers might hold about members of the groups they are researching (Schutz 1964) in order to 'at least *try* to recover an intersubjective engagement which is not reducible' to the 'cultural positionality' of the researcher (Holliday and MacDonald 2019: 13). However, at the interpretation stage, as Dervin suggests, the research interview should be regarded as a *text*, a text which is amenable to critical analysis. In so doing, descriptions of the relationship between the researcher and the researched should include due consideration of any asymmetric distribution of power between participants, both in terms of their interpersonal positioning and their institutional context.

As an extension to the postmodern approach, however, activist research and practice which is informed by the ethics of interculturality engages even more intensely with the relationship between the researcher and the participant(s). First of all, the researcher is

often already engaged in a situational context which requires a committed stance, such as we have seen in Phipps and Kay's migration network (2014) and Tange's scout groups (2016a, 2016b, 2018). However, one recent project has been perhaps paradigmatic of the potential for social activism in intercultural research. After by chance witnessing a critical incident on a bus in Hong Kong, Hans Ladegaard became actively involved in a shelter for abused foreign domestic helpers (2017). These were for the most part, young Filipina and Indonesian women who had migrated to Hong Kong to work as live-in domestic helpers. The researcher initially worked in the evenings to run 'sharing sessions', in which groups of women exchanged their extreme experiences of being assaulted, humiliated, and often starved and deprived of sleep by their employers. However, Ladegaard shortly realised that he could also bring his skills as a sociolinguist to bear upon these narratives of 'powerlessness and repression' not only to better understand them, but also to render their experience visible - in a powerful act of advocacy for this underprivileged group. Thus, Ladegaard declares early on (2017: 22):

> I am under no illusion that I can be a 'neutral' observer; I am on the side of the migrant women and I make no secret of that…. I am also clear about the ultimate goal of this research, both in my communication with the women, and with colleagues, students and members of the public. It is action research that attempts to advance a social justice research agenda through the study of language in its socio-cultural context.

This ethical stance radicalizes the nature of the intercultural researcher's engagement with the participants. In Ladegaard's case, these sharing sessions served principally as a form of catharsis for the women involved and as a record of the encounter, but they

could also be subjected to empirical analysis and interpretation. In this, the researcher played a dual role – both as facilitator of the therapy sessions and instigator of the 'data collection'. Secondly, the form of the talk went beyond the sometimes more prosaic exchanges that take place within the stock-in-trade, two-way research interview or focus group. For Ladegaard, these more lengthy exchanges were viewed as narrative accounts, which take the shape of 'life stories'.

> Notably, they deal, implicitly or explicitly, with identity and notions of 'self' and 'other'; they also deal with notions of belonging, or not belonging, and what it means to (not) have a 'home' and be confined to a life in the diaspora separated from your loved ones (ibid: 34).

Through these sharing sessions, not only were the women able to exchange their experiences with their peers, but the dangerous and constrained circumstances in which some foreign domestic helpers work were also rendered publicly visible.

The emotional intensity and transformative potential evoked in Ladegaard's sharing sessions has also been realised through a range of creative and aesthetic projects reported since the last edition of this handbook, for example, through drama (Harvey et al. 2019) and poster displays (Tange 2018). For Phipps and Kay, working under the aegis of GRAMNET, have initiated a range of different aesthetic initiatives Glasgow, for '… the arts hold together aesthetic, affective, situational and liminal layers which coexist in migratory settings'. (2014: 283). What they dub 'migratory aesthetics':

> …offer the prospect here, through reception, for a linguistic and intercultural aesthetics to emerge as a mode of reflection and also suggest the need for methodologies and theoretical perspectives drawn from the humanities as well

> as from the social sciences, for understanding and analysing what is happening in different settings. (2014: 285)

In my view it is this added depth of the relationship between researcher and participants that characterises this emerging terrain of ethically-driven social activism in intercultural research and practice. Hopefully, the number of these ethically-informed, interventionist initiatives in language and intercultural communication research and practice will continue to grow in the next decade: not only to combat the countervailing trends towards interpersonal separatism, exploitation, abuse and political isolationism, but also to overcome them.

6. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The contributors to this volume have come from diverse backgrounds and, in their own intellectual, academic and professional journeys, have often themselves felt keenly the vicissitudes of interculturality described in previous chapters. Thus this volume has squarely reflected the cultural locatedness of the epistemology of the field of intercultural communication as realized, for example, by the annual distribution of contributors to some of the most prominent journals and association meetings in the field (see also Chapter 1). However, the knowing reader will notice that, despite the best efforts of the editor, some voices remain absent from this volume. From the evidence of this volume and elsewhere, the discourse of intercultural communication still largely remains a conversation which takes place principally between the 'West' and the 'East': i.e. between Europe, North America and other Anglophone countries such as New Zealand and Australia; and China, Japan and South Korea; with the multicultural state of Malaysia positioned at the interface. However with some

exceptions, scholars from the global South remain less widely represented in the field: particularly those located in the Indian sub-continent, the Arab nations or states in Africa. Thus, while the pedagogical politics of languages and cultures have arguably changed over the past twenty years, the *epistemological* politics of knowledge and research into languages and cultures appears to remain relatively undented. Intercultural associations originating in Europe and North America such as the International Association of Language and Intercultural Communication (IALIC) and the International Association for Intercultural Communication Studies (IAICS) now hold meetings in Asian countries, such as China and Japan, as well as in Europe and North America. However, research in intercultural studies remains predominantly published in English and the heft of large scale research grants still emerge from the 'Centre' - large-scale economies who disperse their awards largely in support of their dual interests of internally harmonious multiculturalism and externally expansive globalisation. And the paradigmatic epistemological shifts which are currently being constituted at the Centre, 'researching multilingually' (Chapter 6) and 'translanguaging' (Chapter 15), are already flowing outwards to the Periphery (n.a. 2018).

Within the East-West nexus one or two, admittedly controversial, critics have begun to question the Eurocentrism of core notions in the conceptualisation of intercultural communication. In particular, certain prevalent models of intercultural competence have been critiqued for their orientation towards the individual, which has been attributed to their origins in a distinctively European intellectual and philosophical tradition. This critique has extended also to the values upon which seemingly

'normative' aspects of intercultural competence are built, such as 'respect', 'democracy' and 'tolerance' (Simpson and Dervin 2019b). In this context, perhaps a wider-ranging conversation needs to be carried out and intensified between scholars from *different* traditions of thought, which focuses more on what intercultural communication actually *is* rather than how 'it' can be achieved. And many of us in the European and Anglophone academy still await greater prominence being given to notions of 'interculturality' generated by local Chinese, Japanese and Korean scholars drawing on their own intellectual and philosophical traditions (though see also e.g., Miike 2010).

However, despite having its advocates (e.g. Asante and Miike 2013) contributions from the global South still remain relatively few and far between. A compelling account of one woman's struggle to 'decreate' the hegemony of 'colonial' languages and cultures within her own personal biography as a linguist and academic has been given recently by Alison Phipps (2019; see also Zotzmann, 2019). In her testimony of her sojourns in Eritrea and Waikato, she narrates how her charged encounters not only with the non-hegemonic languages of Tigrinya, Blen and Te Reo, but also with corporeal semiotic practices such as massage, henna and *mihi*, helped her loosen the ties of her own multilingualism to its biographically-determined, colonial moorings. From these trajectories, we can perhaps glimpse some of the possibilities for a broadening global agenda for ethical language and intercultural communication research and practice in the decade to come. Given the increasing urgency of the global conditions in which we all work, this may well feature: a wider reaching and intensification of social activism in intercultural research and pedagogy: a renewed authorisation and acceptance of the subjectification of intercultural research (be it expressed through creative and aesthetic

endeavours, or through narrative accounts of intercultural sojourners); increased reciprocity of ideas both from the East to the West; and surely, an intensification of the intellectual, intercultural, multilingual and aesthetic engagement of scholars from the global South with scholars, activists and artists who work, live and create in the global North.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks to the following for conversations and exchanges over the past year which have informed this chapter: Adrian Holliday, Chris Anderson, Cristina Ros i Solé, Hanne Tange, Hans J. Ladegaard, Harry Kuchah, Maggie Conn, Prue Holmes, Yuemeng Tang, and all at *Cutting Edges 2019* (CCU Canterbury).

RELATED TOPICS

Culture, communication, context, and power; researching multilingually; constructing the cultural Other; intercultural contact, hybridity, and third space; translanguaging, identity, and intercultural mediation; critical intercultural language pedagogy; social justice, diversity, and intercultural-global citizenship education.

FURTHER READING

Dasli, M. and Diaz, A. (eds) (2017) *The Critical Turn in Language and Intercultural Communication Pedagogy: Theory, Research and Practice*, New York: Routledge. (This book explores the development of the 'critical turn' in intercultural communication pedagogy. The volume argues that intercultural communication pedagogy should locate itself within wider socio-political contexts. Readers are provided with ways of achieving this, and appreciating the impact that an understanding of criticality can make on modern/foreign language education).

Ferri, G. (2018). *Intercultural Communication: Critical Approaches and Future Challenges,* London: Palgrave Macmillan. (This book critically examines intercultural theory and its interrelations with globalisation, education and dialogue in multicultural societies. Applying the ethics of Emmanuel Levinas, the author repositions intercultural communication within a new paradigm that challenges static interpretations of self and other.)

Ladegaard, H. J. (2017). *The Discourse of Powerlessness and Repression: Life Stories of Domestic Migrant Workers in Hong Kong,* London: Routledge. (Drawing on a large corpus of narratives contributed by abused domestic helpers in Hong Kong, Ladegaard's book investigates how the women discursively construct themselves in 'sharing sessions' with helpers. Through its analysis of these narratives, the book explores issues such as global migration, exploitation, language and power, abuse and the psychology of evil, intergroup communication, and peer support and empowerment).

Phipps, A. (2019) *Decolonising Multilingualism: Struggles to Decreate*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

(What if my own multilingualism is simply that of one who is fluent in way too many colonial languages?

If we are going to do this, if we are going to decolonise multilingualism, let's do it as an attempt at a way of doing it.

If we are going to do this, let's cite with an eye to decolonising.

If we are going to do this then let's improvise and devise. This is how we might learn the arts of decolonising.

If we are going to do this then we need different companions.

If we are going to do this we will need artists and poetic activists.

If we are going to do this, let's do it in a way which is as local as it is global; which affirms the granulations of the way peoples name their worlds.

Finally, if we are going to do this, let's do it multilingually.)

REFERENCES

------- (2018) *Overcoming barriers to university education in South Africa*. Video available at: https://tlang.org.uk/2018/07/19/overcoming-barriers-to-university-education-in-south-africa/ (accessed 01/09/2019)

Asante, M. K. and Miike, Y. (2013) 'Paradigmatic issues in intercultural communication studies: An Afrocentric-Asiacentric dialogue', *China Media Research*, 9(3): 1-19.

Bauman, Z. (1998) *Globalization : the human consequences*, Polity Press.

Billig, M. (1995) *Banal nationalism*, London: Sage.

Brumfit, C. (1995) 'Teacher Professionalism and Research', in G. Cook and B. Seidlhofer (eds) *Principles and Practice in Applied Linguistics, Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 27-42.

Burford-Rice, R., Augoustinos, M. and Due, D. (2020) '"That's what they say in our language: one onion, all smell"': The impact of racism on the resettlement experiences of South Sudanese women in Australia', in H. J. Ladegaard and A. Phipps (eds) 'Translational Research: Language, Intercultural Communication and Social Action', special issue of *Language & Intercultural Communication*, 20(1): forthcoming.

Byram, M. (ed) (1997) *Face to face: learning 'language-and-culture' through visits and exchanges*, London: CILT.

Canagarajah, A. S. (ed) (2017) *Routledge Handbook of Migration and Language*, London: Routledge.

Castro, P., Woodin, J,. Lundgren, U. and Byram, M. (2016) 'Student mobility and internationalisation in higher education: perspectives from practitioners', *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 16(3): 418-436.

Collins, H. (2018) 'Interculturality from above and below: navigating uneven discourses in a neoliberal university system', *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 18(2): 167-183.

Cools, C. A. (2006) 'Relational Communication in Intercultural Couples', *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 6 (3-4): 262-274.

Côrte-Real, M.S.J., Moreira, P. and Lesenciuc, A. (eds) (2016) 'Music and Human Mobility', in São José Côrte-Real, Maria & Pedro Moreira (eds), *Selection of peer reviewed papers presented within the 5th International Conference Music and Human Mobility-ICMHM'16, Redefining Community in Intercultural Context*, Lisbon,7-9 June, 2016.

Council of Europe. 2008. White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue: "Living Together as Equals in Dignity". Launched by the Council of Europe Ministers of Foreign Affairs at their 118th Ministerial Session, Strasbourg, May 7.

Creese, A. and Blackledge, A. (2017) *Routledge Handbook of Language and Superdiversity*, London: Routledge.

Dervin, F. (2011) 'A plea for change in research on intercultural discourses: A 'liquid' approach to the study of the acculturation of Chinese students,' *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 6(1): 37-52.

Dervin F., Layne, H. J. and Simpson, A. (2016-present) *International Journal of Bias, Identity and Diversities in Education.* IGI Global.

Dippold, D., Bridges, S., Eccles, S. and Mullen, E. (2019) 'Developing the global graduate: how first year university students' narrate their experiences of culture', *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 19(4): 313-327.

Faist, T. (ed) (2000) *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

------- (2016) 'The Border-Crossing Expansion of Social Space: Concepts, Questions and Topics', in T. Faist and E. Özveren (eds) *Transnational Social Spaces: Agents, Networks and Institutions*, Oxford: Routledge, pp. 1-36.

------, Fauser, M. and Reisenauer, E. (2013) *Transnational migration*, London: Polity.

Foottit, H. (2017) 'International aid and development: hearing multilingualism, learning from intercultural encounters in the history of Oxfam GB', in P. Holmes, R. Fay, and J. Andrews (eds) 'Education and migration: Languages foregrounded', special issue of *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 17(4): 518-533.

Frimberger, K. (2016a) 'A Brechtian theatre pedagogy for intercultural education research', *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 16(2): 130-147.

------- (2016b) 'Hearing as Touch in a Multilingual Film Interview: The Interviewer's Linguistic Incompetence as Aesthetic Key Moment', *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 10(2): 107-120.

------- (2016c) 'Towards a well being focussed language pedagogy: Enabling arts-based, multilingual learning spaces for young people with refugee backgrounds', *Pedagogy, Culture, Society*, 24(2): 285-299.

Frimberger, K., White, R. and Ma, L. (2018) '"If I didn't know you what would you want me to see?": Poetic mappings in neo-materialist research with young asylum seekers and refugees', *Applied Linguistics Review*, 21(2-3). Available: https://www.degruyter. com/view/j/alr.ahead-of-print/applirev-2016-1061/applirev-2016-1061.xml ((accessed 19 June 2019).

Gray, J., O'Regan, J. P. and Wallace, J. (eds) (2018) 'Education and the discourse of global neoliberalism', *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 8(5): 471-589.

Greenbank, E. and Marra, M. (2020) 'Addressing societal discourses: Negotiating an employable identity as a former refugee', in H. J. Ladegaard and A. Phipps (eds) 'Translational Research: Language, Intercultural Communication and Social Action', special issue of *Language & Intercultural Communication*, 20(1): forthcoming.

Harvey, L., McCormick., B. and Vanden, K. (2019) 'Becoming at the boundaries of language: Dramatic Enquiry for intercultural learning in UK higher education', *Language and Intercultural Communication*. Available: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/ full/10.1080/14708477.2019.1586912.

Hirst, P. Q., Thompson, G and Bromley, S. (2009) *Globalization in Question: The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hirsu, L. (2020) 'Lessons in response-ability: reframing intercultural communication for social and linguistic integration', in H. J. Ladegaard and A. Phipps (eds) 'Translational Research: Language, Intercultural Communication and Social Action', *Language & Intercultural Communication*, 20(1): forthcoming.

Hoerder, D. (2002) *Cultures in Contact: World Migrations in the Second Millennium*, Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Holliday, A. (2010) 'Complexity in cultural identity', *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 10(2): 165-177.

Holliday, A. and MacDonald, M. N. (2019) 'Researching the Intercultural: Intersubjectivity and the Problem with Postpositivism', *Applied Linguistics*. Available: https://0-doi-org. pugwash. lib. warwick.ac.uk/ 0.1093/applin/amz006.

International Organization for Migration (IOM) (2018) *World Migration Report 2018*. Available http://publications.iom.int/system/ files/pdf/wmr_2018_en.pdf (accessed 19 February 2019).

Jackson, J. (2008) *Language, identity, and study abroad : sociocultural perspectives*. London; Oakville: Equinox Pub.

------- (2010) *Intercultural journeys : from study to residence abroad*. Basingstoke, England; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

------- (ed) (2012) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication* (1st edition). Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge.

Kay, R. and Morrison, A. (2012) *Evidencing the social and cultural benefits and costs of migration in Scotland*, Glasgow: COSLA Strategic Migration Partnership.

Kivisto, P. (2002) *Multiculturalism in a Global Society*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Kolb, D. A. (1984) *Experiential Learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kung, F-W. (2016) 'The reorientation of international expatriates' language and cultural identities from a religious ethnic community institution and community of practice: a multicultural and multilingual perspective', *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 16(4): 535-551.

Ladegaard, H. J. (2017) *The Discourse of Powerlessness and Repression: Life Stories of Domestic Migrant Workers in Hong Kong*, London: Routledge.

Ladegaard H. J. and Phipps, A. (eds) (2020) ‘Translational Research: Language, Intercultural Communication and Social Action’, special issue of *Language and Intercultural Communication* 20(2): forthcoming.

Lando, A. L., Muthuri, L. and Odira, P.R. (2015) ‘The importance of interfaith dialogue in the workplace for achieving organizational goals: a Kenyan case study’, *Language and Intercultural Communication,* 15(1): 62-75.

MacDonald, M. N. and O'Regan, J.P. (2012) ‘The Global Agenda in Intercultural Communication Research and Practice’, in J. Jackson (ed) *The Routledge handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication,* London: Routledge, pp. 553-567.

McConachy Troy (ed) (2018-present) *Intercultural Communication Education*. Castledown.

Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) (2015) *Access to Nationality*. Available: http://www.mipex.eu/access-nationality (accessed 24 February 2019).

Miike, Y. (2010) ‘An anatomy of Eurocentrism in communication scholarship: The role of Asiacentricity in de-Westernizing theory and research’, *China Media Research,* 6(1): 1-11.

Modood, T. (2007) *Multiculturalism,* Cambridge: Polity.

Phipps, A. and Kay, R. (2014) ‘Languages in migratory settings: Place, politics and aesthetics’, *Language and Intercultural Communication,* 14(3): 273-286.

Phipps, A. (2019) *Decolonising Multilingualism: Struggles to Decreate,* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Piacentini, T., O'Donnell, C. , Phipps, A. , Jackson, I. and Stack, N. (2019) ‘Moving beyond the ‘language problem’: developing an understanding of the

intersections of health, language and immigration status in interpreter-mediated health encounters', *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 19(3): 256-271.

Patiño-Santos, A. and & R. Márquez Reiter (2019) 'Banal interculturalism: Latin Americans in Elephant and Castle, London'. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 19:3, 227-241,

Rampton, B. (2005) *Crossing: Language & Ethnicity among Adolescents*, Manchester, UK & Northampton MA: St. Jerome Publishing.

Riitaoja A.-L. and Dervin, F. (2014) 'Interreligious dialogue in schools: beyond asymmetry and categorisation?', *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 14(1): 76-90.

Scarabicchi, C. (2020) 'Migration Manifestos: Performing Border Dissent in the 2010s', in H. J. Ladegaard and A. Phipps (eds) 'Translational Research: Language, Intercultural Communication and Social Action', special issue of *Language & Intercultural Communication,* 20(1): forthcoming.

Schluter, A. (2020) 'Measuring the effectiveness of theory in action: Grass-roots initiatives and social justice for Japan's Kurdish migrants', in H. J. Ladegaard and A. Phipps (eds) 'Translational Research: Language, Intercultural Communication and Social Action', special issue of *Language & Intercultural Communication,* 20(1): forth-coming.

Schutz, A. (1964) *Collected papers* (Vol. 2). Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.

Simpson, A. and Dervin, F. (2019a) 'Forms of dialogism in the Council of Europe Reference Framework on Competences for Democratic Culture', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development.* Available: www.tandfonline.com/ doi /abs/ 10. 1080/ 01434632. 2019.1618317

-------- (2019b) ‘Democracy’ in education: an omnipresent yet distanced ‘other’, *Palgrave Communications,* 3(1). Available at: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-017-0012-5 (accessed 25 May 2019).

Soutar, L. (2010) ‘British female converts to Islam: choosing Islam as a rejection of individualism’, *Language and Intercultural Communication,* 10(1): 3-16.

Tange, H., (2016a) *From national stereotypes to interconnectivity: On changing the researcher’s perspective*. Unpublished paper presented at the 23rd NIC conference, NLA University College, Bergen, November 24-26.

-------- (2016b) *National stereotypes or cosmopolitanism? The 23rd World Scout Jamboree as a site for intercultural learning.* Unpublished paper presented at the BIBAC conference, University of Cambridge, July 30 to August 1.

-------- (2018) *How can we educate intercultural citizens when the children are afraid*? Unpublished paper presented at the 25th NIC conference, University of Aalborg, November 29 to December 1.

Turner, B.S. and Holton R.J. (eds) (2016) *The Routledge International Handbook of Globalization Studies* (2nd edition), London: Routledge.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA) (2017) *International Migration Report*. Available: https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/publications/migrationreport/migreport.asp (accessed 19 February 2019).

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2009) *Overcoming Barriers: Human Mobility and Development*, New York: UNDP. Available: http://hdr.undp.org/ sites/default/files/reports/269/hdr_2009_en_complete.pdf (accessed 19 February 2019).

Witteborn, S. 'The role of transnational NGOs in promoting global citizenship and globalizing communication practices', *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 10(4): 358-372.

Wolf, A. (2012) 'Intercultural identity and inter-religious dialogue: a holy place to be?', *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 12(1): 37-55.

Zotzmann, K. (2019) Review of 'Decolonising Multilingualism'. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 19(6): forthcoming.